

REMARKS**Summary of the Office Action**

Claims 1-8 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Someya et al. (US 5,528,396) in view of Kim et al. (US 6,091,466), and claim 19 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Someya et al. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections as being based upon prior art references that neither teach nor suggest the novel combination of features recited in amended independent claims 1 and 19, and hence dependent claims 2-10 and 20.

Independent claim 1, as amended, recites a liquid crystal display device including, in part, “first and second dummy metal layers formed on the extrinsic semiconductor layer disposed over the gate line and arranged on opposite sides of the data line.” Similarly, independent claim 19, as amended, recites a liquid crystal display device including, in part, “first and second dummy metal layers disposed on a semiconductor layer over the gate line and on opposite sides of the data line.” In contrast to Applicants’ claimed invention and commensurate with features alleged by the Office Action to be shown by Someya et al., FIGs. 1 and 2 of Someya et al. clearly show a light shielding film LS arranged on a protection film PSV1 made of silicon oxide or silicon nitride.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Someya et al. fails to teach or suggest, at least, “a liquid crystal display device including “first and second dummy metal layers on the extrinsic semiconductor layer disposed over the gate line and arranged on opposite sides of the data line,” as recited by amended independent claim 1, and hence dependent claims 2-10.

Similarly, Applicants respectfully submit that Someya et al. fails to teach or suggest, at least,

“first and second dummy metal layers disposed on a semiconductor layer over the gate line and on opposite sides of the data line,” as recited by amended independent claim 19, and hence dependent claim 20.

Applicants further assert that the Office Action does not rely on Kim et al. to remedy the deficiencies of Someya et al. Moreover, Applicants respectfully assert that Kim et al. cannot remedy the deficiencies of Someya et al. For example, Applicants respectfully submit that Kim et al. is completely silent with respect to a light shielding layer, much less a light shielding layer arranged on opposite sides of a data line.

For at least the above reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-10, 19, and 20 are neither taught nor suggested by either of Someya et al. and/or Kim et al. Applicants respectfully assert that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§102(b) and 103(a) should be withdrawn because the above-discussed novel combinations of features are neither taught nor suggested by any of the applies references.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request entry of the amendments, reconsideration and the timely allowance of all pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such as an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

By: Mary Jane Boswell
Mary Jane Boswell
Reg. No. 33,652

Date: September 8, 2004

CUSTOMER NO. 009629
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
(202) 739-3000